

Message

From: Wozniak, Chris [wozniak.chris@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/15/2020 3:53:54 PM
To: Kough, John [Kough.John@epa.gov]; Kirk, Cassandra [kirk.cassandra@epa.gov]; Striegel, Wiebke [Striegel.Wiebke@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: first arboDER
Attachments: 50889425 Arbovirus Testing 4.14.20-CAW.docx

Cassie et al.,

I agree with John's assessment. My only edit in this paragraph, is with respect to "male eggs" being shipped. Eggs are shipped and then the female eggs fail to hatch in the rearing box or wherever they are deployed. Oxitec cannot sex the eggs prior to hatching.

I am attaching the DER draft with a couple other minor edits. It is greatly improved IMHO!

Thanks,

Chris

Chris A Wozniak, Ph.D.
Biotechnology Special Assistant
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Pesticide Programs
Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division
(703) 308-4043 - office
(703) 308-7026 - fax
wozniak.chris@epa.gov

Mailing Address:
U.S. EPA-OPP
Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division Mailcode:7511P
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington DC 20460

Courier Address:
U.S. EPA-OPP
Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division
8th Floor, S-8328
2777 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202

Do not believe everything you read on the internet, especially quotes from famous people.
Abraham Lincoln (probably)

From: Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 11:15 AM
To: Kirk, Cassandra <kirk.cassandra@epa.gov>; Striegel, Wiebke <Striegel.Wiebke@epa.gov>; Wozniak, Chris <wozniak.chris@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: first arboDER

Cassie,

This looks like a good lead in to the discussion and frames the EUP issues well to conclude the further arbovirus testing is needed but not at this time or for the UK production site.

John K.

From: Kirk, Cassandra <kirk.cassandra@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 10:49 AM

To: Striegel, Wiebke <Striegel.Wiebke@epa.gov>; Wozniak, Chris <wozniak.chris@epa.gov>; Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: first arboDER

Thanks Wiebke,

I had the same concern and I think putting it into the context of “these are some of the considerations discussed later” would help address the redundancy and make it flow a little better. I did a little editing as per your suggestion but I’ve left in the findings regarding the presence of the vector and arboviruses in the UK because Chris had stressed the importance of having those citations up front in this DER.

All, Let me know what you think of this paragraph. I could delete the findings if we feel the rest adequately ties the two DERs together but I am fine with leaving the citations in too.

STUDY PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND:

Oxitec submitted the study in order to demonstrate the absence of arbovirus infections in the OX5034 production colony. OX5034 mosquitoes were tested for arboviruses including DENV, CHIKV, WNV, SLE, EEE, WEE, VEE, MAY and SIN viruses. The current review focusses on the diagnostic validity of the Vector Test® dipstick assay. An evaluation of the appropriate selection of arboviruses for which to screen the source colony located in the UK, is addressed in MRID 51094403.

It is of note that for the EUP, the colony will be maintained at Oxitec’s insectary in Milton Park, UK and OX5034 male eggs will be shipped to rearing facilities in the US for deployment to release sites. Briefly, some of the considerations discussed later pertain to the presence in the UK of *Aedes aegypti* populations and the arboviruses for which it is a vector. The UK currently has no known established populations of any invasive *Aedes* spp. mosquitoes (Medlock et al., 2019). In addition, none of the arboviruses (DENV, CHIKV, WNV, YFV, and Zika Virus) for which *Aedes aegypti* is a major vector occur naturally in the UK (ECDPC, 2017).

Thanks,
Cassie

From: Striegel, Wiebke <Striegel.Wiebke@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2020 9:53 AM

To: Kirk, Cassandra <kirk.cassandra@epa.gov>; Wozniak, Chris <wozniak.chris@epa.gov>; Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: first arboDER

Hello Cassie,

I briefly looked at the “study purpose and background” section. The info you have there connects this DER to the other 75-day letter, and therefore accomplishes what we talked about yesterday. Since this remains a stand-alone DER and to cut down on redundancy, I am wondering if it would be appropriate to talk about the information you provided in the context of “these are some of the considerations discussed later” rather than presenting some of the findings.

One thing you may want to consider is to move the last paragraph starting with “The current review focuses..” in front of “It is of note that for the EUP, the colony...” That way you could follow this up with: Briefly,....

From: Kirk, Cassandra <kirk.cassandra@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 5:29 PM

To: Wozniak, Chris <wozniak.chris@epa.gov>; Striegel, Wiebke <Striegel.Wiebke@epa.gov>; Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>

Subject: first arboDER

Hello,

The only sections that have changed are the “Background and Purpose” up front and “Reviewer’s Conclusion and Recommendation” at the end. Let me know what you think.

Thanks!

Cassie